

SELF-STABILIZATION IN CERTAIN INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL MATRIX ALGEBRAS

GYULA LAKOS

ABSTRACT. Analytical tools to K -theory; namely, self-stabilization of rapidly decreasing matrices, linearization of cyclic loops, and the contractibility of the pointed stable Toeplitz algebra are discussed in terms of concrete formulas. Adaptation to the $*$ -algebra and finite perturbation categories is also considered. The finite linearizability of algebraically finite cyclic loops is demonstrated.

0. INTRODUCTION

When learning the basics of K -theory one likely encounters stabilization of matrices, linearization of cyclic loops, and the contractibility of the pointed stable Toeplitz algebra. Stabilization of matrices is a fundamental feature of K -theory; linearization of cyclic loops is an important method to prove complex Bott periodicity; the Toeplitz algebra can also be used for the same purpose, but it is also an excellent tool to construct classifying spaces.

Although considered simple, these basic constructions are often treated in quite awkward manners in the literature. The purpose of this paper is just to show that how these topics can be discussed in a unified and simple way. Our statements are formulated primarily in the setting of locally convex algebras. That is not for the sake of extreme generality but to show that concrete formulas and maps can be very successful, without using approximations.

The main statements of this paper can be summarized as follows:

0.1. Statement (Self-stabilization). *Assume that $\mathfrak{A} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})$, ie. the locally convex algebra of rapidly decreasing matrices over an other locally convex algebra $\mathfrak{S}$. Let $r : \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ be an isomorphism which comes from relabeling $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})$ into $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})$. Then we claim: There is a smooth homotopy*

$$E : \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \times [0, \pi/2] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$$

such that it yields a family of endomorphisms of $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$, which are isomorphisms for $\theta \in [0, \pi/2)$, and a closed injective endomorphism for $\theta = \pi/2$; with

$$E(A, 0) = A, \quad E(A, \pi/2) = r(A)\mathbf{e}_{0,0} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \begin{matrix} \ddots & \\ & 0 \end{matrix} & \\ \hline & \begin{matrix} r(A) & \\ & 0 & \\ & & \ddots \end{matrix} \end{array} \right].$$

This statement extends to unit groups, showing that $U(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}))$ can be pushed down by a homotopy into $U(\mathfrak{A}\mathbf{e}_{00})$.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 19K99, Secondary: 47B35.

Key words and phrases. Linearization of loops, stabilization, Toeplitz algebra, Bott periodicity, locally convex algebras.

(The continuous map $\phi : \mathfrak{A} \times [0, \pi/2]_\theta \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is smooth in the variable θ if the higher partial derivatives $\partial_\theta^n \phi : \mathfrak{A} \times [0, \pi/2]_\theta \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ are still continuous functions.)

Let $\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty$ be the algebra of formal Laurent series with rapidly decreasing coefficients.

0.2. Statement (Linearization of cyclic loops). *There is a smooth homotopy*

$$K : \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty) \times [0, \pi/2] \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty)),$$

such that for $a(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_n z^n$, $a(z)^{-1} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} b_n z^n$, it yields

$$K(a(z), \pi/2) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \begin{array}{ccc} \ddots & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \end{array} & \\ \hline & \begin{array}{ccc} a(z)a(1)^{-1} & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & \ddots \end{array} \end{array} \right]$$

but

$$K(a(z), 0) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \begin{array}{ccc} \ddots & & \\ & z^{-1} & \\ & & z^{-1} \end{array} & \\ \hline & \begin{array}{ccc} 1 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & \ddots \end{array} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \begin{array}{ccc} \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ \ddots & a_0 & a_{-1} \\ \ddots & a_1 & a_0 \end{array} & \begin{array}{ccc} \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ a_{-2} & a_{-3} & \ddots \\ a_{-1} & a_{-2} & \ddots \end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{ccc} \ddots & a_2 & a_1 \\ \ddots & a_3 & a_2 \\ \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{array} & \begin{array}{ccc} a_0 & a_{-1} & \ddots \\ a_1 & a_0 & \ddots \\ \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{array} \end{array} \right] \\ \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \begin{array}{ccc} \ddots & & \\ & z & \\ & & z \end{array} & \\ \hline & \begin{array}{ccc} 1 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & \ddots \end{array} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \begin{array}{ccc} \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ \ddots & b_0 & b_{-1} \\ \ddots & b_1 & b_0 \end{array} & \begin{array}{ccc} \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ b_{-2} & b_{-3} & \ddots \\ b_{-1} & b_{-2} & \ddots \end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{ccc} \ddots & b_2 & b_1 \\ \ddots & b_3 & b_2 \\ \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{array} & \begin{array}{ccc} b_0 & b_{-1} & \ddots \\ b_1 & b_0 & \ddots \\ \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{array} \end{array} \right].$$

In a more compact notation the large quadruple matrix product can be written as $\Lambda(z, Q)^{-1} \mathcal{U}(a) \Lambda(z, Q) \mathcal{U}(a)^{-1}$, where $\Lambda(z, Q)$ is the linear loop generated by the Hilbert transform, and $\mathcal{U}(a)$ is the operator of multiplication by $a(z)$.

The statement about Toeplitz algebras is really simple:

0.3. Statement (Toeplitz contractibility). *Let $\mathfrak{A} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})$. Then, the unit group of the pointed Toeplitz algebra over $\mathfrak{A}$, ie. $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})^{\text{po}})$, is contractible.*

These statements were formulated in the smooth category. Often, however is useful to work in slightly different categories. One case is when $\mathfrak{A}$ is a $*$ -algebra. In those cases instead of the general unit group $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A})$ of invertible elements one should work with the group $\mathcal{U}^*(\mathfrak{A})$ of unitary elements. Another type of restriction occurs in the finite perturbation category, when the algebra of rapidly decreasing matrices, $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})$ is replaced by the algebra of matrices with finitely many nonzero entries $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{f}}(\mathfrak{S})$, and $\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty$, the algebra of rapidly decreasing Laurent series is replaced by the algebra

$\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^f$. Here one should be careful, because for loops being finite and invertible does not generally implies that the inverse is finite.

0.4. Statement. *Statements 0.1–0.3 restrict to the $*$ -algebra and/or finite perturbation categories.*

The setting of finite perturbations, may, however, be too restrictive. Let us call an element $a(z) \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty)$ algebraically finite if $a = a_s \dots a_1$ where for each s one of a_s and $(a_s)^{-1}$ has finite Laurent series form. The algebraically finite elements of $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty)$ fall into various finiteness classes F depending on the length of the elements a_s or $(a_s)^{-1}$. Let $\mathfrak{A}_F$ be the set of decompositions $\{a_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq s}$ compatible to F . Then Statement 0.2 can be augmented as follows:

0.5. Statement. *For a finiteness class F there is a smooth homotopy*

$$K_F : \mathfrak{A}_F \times [0, \pi/2] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty),$$

such that

- i.) $K_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, 0) = K(a, \theta)$;
- ii.) $K_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, 1)$ differs from $1_{\mathbb{Z}}$ in finitely many places (depending on F);
- iii.) $K_F(\tilde{a}, \pi/2, h)$ is constant;
- iv.) $K_F(\tilde{a}, 0, h) = \Lambda(z, Q)^{-1} U_F(\tilde{a}, h) \Lambda(z, Q) U_F(\tilde{a}, h)^{-1}$.

Here $U_F(\tilde{a}, h)$ differs from $U(a)$ in a rapidly decreasing matrix.

In particular, $K_F(\tilde{a}, 0, 1)$ yields a finite linearization of $a(z)a(1)^{-1}$.

These statements are all well-known or, at least, can expected in various ways: Statement 0.1, as stated here in the smooth category (but see 0.4), follows from Cuntz, [3], Section 2. Statement 0.2 is a quantitative version of the well-known linearization technique of Atiyah and Bott, [1]; but much resembling to the formulas of Pressley and Segal, [6], Ch. 6, who work with Hilbert-Schmidt matrices, instead of rapidly decreasing ones. Statement 0.3 comes from the original Toeplitz argument of Cuntz, [2], originally stated in the context of C^* -algebras, but subsequently adapted to the smooth case, cf. also [3]. Statement 0.4 is useful, because $*$ -algebras are prominent in operator algebraic discussions; and the finite perturbation category is the technically easiest setting to provide large contractible spaces for the purposes of algebraic topology. Statement 0.5 amounts to an explicit computation in the less functorial but more concrete setting of [1]. Our point, however, is that the statements above hold in the generality indicated and using only the most elementary and explicit methods. Moreover, we demonstrate is that we can prove these statements by a skillful use of conjugation by matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} \pm\sqrt{1-t^2} & \pm t\sqrt{1-t^2} & \pm t^2\sqrt{1-t^2} & \pm t^3\sqrt{1-t^2} & \pm t^4\sqrt{1-t^2} & \dots \\ -t & 1-t^2 & t(1-t^2) & t^2(1-t^2) & t^3(1-t^2) & \dots \\ & -t & 1-t^2 & t(1-t^2) & t^2(1-t^2) & \ddots \\ & & -t & 1-t^2 & t(1-t^2) & \ddots \\ & & & -t & 1-t^2 & \ddots \\ & & & & -t & \ddots \\ & & & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix},$$

which, in turn, are nothing else but just naive infinite products of rotations.

Sections 1–2 form an introduction into some basics and clarify our conventions. mentioned. Sections 3–7 deal with Statements 0.1–0.5 respectively.

The constructions presented here are more or less improved versions of some constructions which can be found in my PhD thesis [4]. I am indebted Prof. Richard B. Melrose, my advisor. In fact, much of this content was motivated by the geometric idea of Melrose, Rochon [5]. I would also like to thank Prof. Joachim Cuntz, who called my attention to some papers.

1. A GENERAL FRAMEWORK FOR COMPUTATIONS

Unit groups.

1.1. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is a not necessarily unital algebra then one can formally consider elements of shape $1 + a$, ($a \in \mathfrak{A}$), which multiply as $(1 + a)(1 + b) = 1 + (a + b + ab)$. In that way $1 + \mathfrak{A}$ becomes a semigroup. If $\mathfrak{A}$ was a topological ring, then there is a natural topology on $1 + \mathfrak{A}$ induced from the topology of $\mathfrak{A}$. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is unital, then it is customary to identify $\mathfrak{A}$ and $1 + \mathfrak{A}$ by the recipe $a \in \mathfrak{A} \leftrightarrow 1 - (1_{\mathfrak{A}} - a) \in 1 + \mathfrak{A}$, which is compatible with the multiplicative structure. This is also the situation if there is a natural identity element lurking around $\mathfrak{A}$, like the identity matrix in the case of matrix algebras.

The unit group $U(\mathfrak{A})$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ is the unit group of the semigroup $1 + \mathfrak{A}$. I.e. it is the group of pairs $(1 + a, 1 + b) \in (1 + \mathfrak{A}) \times (1 + \mathfrak{A})$ such that $(1 + a)(1 + b) = (1 + b)(1 + a) = 1$. The group operations are the multiplication map $(1 + a_1, 1 + b_1)(1 + a_2, 1 + b_2) = ((1 + a_1)(1 + a_2), (1 + b_1)(1 + b_2))$, the inverse $(1 + a, 1 + b)^{-1} = (1 + b, 1 + a)$, and the identity $1_{U(\mathfrak{A})} = (1, 1)$. If $\mathfrak{A}$ was a topological ring, then there is a natural topology on $U(\mathfrak{A})$ which comes from the product topology of $(1 + \mathfrak{A}) \times (1 + \mathfrak{A})$ by restriction. It is easy to see that if $(1 + a, 1 + b) \in U(\mathfrak{A})$ then $1 + a$ determines $1 + b$ (and the other way around), so, instead of “ $(1 + a, 1 + b)$ ” we can (and generally do) use “ $1 + a$ ” to denote the element of $U(\mathfrak{A})$ is question. But this latter notation does not properly account for the topology of the unit group.

The unit group construction is certainly a functor: If $\phi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a (continuous) homomorphism, then it induces a (continuous) map $U\phi : U(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{B})$ defined by $(1 + a, 1 + b) \mapsto (1 + \phi(a), 1 + \phi(b))$. When we meet a homomorphism of algebras it will always be understood that we automatically extend it to unit groups as above. We will simply write ϕ instead of $U\phi$.

Matrix algebras.

1.2. In what follows “a locally convex vector space $\mathfrak{A}$ ” means a sequentially complete, Hausdorff, locally convex vector space $\mathfrak{A}$. The completeness is essential for analytic purposes. If the topology of $\mathfrak{A}$ is induced by a set $\Pi_{\mathfrak{A}}$ of seminorms then we assume that any positive integral combination of these seminorms also belongs to the generating seminorm set. A locally convex algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ is a locally convex vector space with continuous linear multiplication. So, for each seminorm $p \in \Pi_{\mathfrak{A}}$ there is an other seminorm $\tilde{p} \in \Pi_{\mathfrak{A}}$ such that for all $X_1, X_2 \in \mathfrak{A}$ the inequality $p(X_1 X_2) \leq \tilde{p}(X_1) \tilde{p}(X_2)$ holds.

An inductive locally convex vector space $\mathfrak{A}$ is an indexed family of locally convex vector spaces $\{\mathfrak{A}_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ such that the following holds: Λ is an upward directed partially ordered set, i.e. for $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ there is an element $\nu \geq \lambda, \mu$. For all $\mu \geq \lambda$ there exist continuous inclusions $T_{\mu}^{\lambda} : \mathfrak{A}_{\lambda} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_{\mu}$; and for $\nu \geq \mu \geq \lambda$ one has $T_{\nu}^{\mu} \circ T_{\mu}^{\lambda} = T_{\nu}^{\lambda}$. Now, $\mathfrak{A}$ is an inductive locally convex algebra if for each $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ there is an element $\text{prod}(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda$, and for $\nu \geq \text{prod}(\lambda, \mu)$ bilinear products $M_{\lambda, \mu}^{\nu} : \mathfrak{A}_{\lambda} \times \mathfrak{A}_{\mu} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_{\nu}$ compatible to the inclusions and the usual algebraic prescriptions. An element of $\mathfrak{A}$ is an element of $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathfrak{A}_{\lambda}$ making identifications along the inclusion maps. In that way $\mathfrak{A}$ will be an algebra. The algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ has not an ordinary but an “inductive”

topology coming from the filtration $\{\mathfrak{A}_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, such that the vector space structure respects the filtration but the algebra structure does not. If the spaces $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ have inductive topologies with filtrations $\{\mathfrak{A}_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ and $\{\mathfrak{B}_\mu\}_{\mu \in M}$ then a map $\phi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is continuous if for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there is an element $\mu \in M$ such that there is a continuous map $\phi_\lambda : \mathfrak{A}_\lambda \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}_\mu$, which is set-theoretically a restriction of ϕ . Direct products of spaces with inductive and/or ordinary topologies can easily be defined. In particular, a deformation $\phi : \mathfrak{A} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is continuous if and only if a similar restriction condition holds.

1.3. If A, B are sets then we denote the set of functions from A to B by $\mathcal{F}(A; B)$. Suppose that Θ_1, Θ_2 are sets and $\mathfrak{V}$ is a vector space. Then a $\mathfrak{V}$ -valued $\Theta_1 \times \Theta_2$ matrix is just a formal sum over $\Theta_1 \times \Theta_2$ with coefficients from $\mathfrak{V}$ (ie. just a function from $\Theta_1 \times \Theta_2$ to $\mathfrak{V}$):

$$s = \sum_{(a,b) \in \Theta_1 \times \Theta_2} s_{a,b} \mathbf{e}_{a,b} \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{V}).$$

We write $\mathcal{M}(\Theta; \mathfrak{V})$ instead of $\mathcal{M}(\Theta, \Theta; \mathfrak{V})$ and similarly for other spaces in the future. For column and row matrices we use the notation $\mathbf{e}_a = \mathbf{e}_{a,*}$ and $\mathbf{e}_b^\top = \mathbf{e}_{*,b}$ respectively and we make the formal identification $\mathbf{e}_{a,b} = \mathbf{e}_a \otimes \mathbf{e}_b^\top$. For the column and row spaces we use the notation $\mathcal{S}(\Theta; \mathfrak{V}) = \mathcal{M}(\Theta, \{*\}; \mathfrak{V})$ and $\mathcal{S}(\Theta; \mathfrak{V})^\top = \mathcal{M}(\{*\}, \Theta; \mathfrak{V})$, respectively. We can multiply matrices only if it makes sense positionwise. We can always take a transpose, however. We use the notation $1_\Theta = \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbf{e}_{\theta,\theta}$, and in general circumstances we consider the identity matrix 1_Θ as the adjoint unit in a non-unital $\Theta \times \Theta$ matrix algebra.

1.4. On the set $\mathbb{N}$ of natural numbers there is the natural space $\mathcal{S}^{-\infty}(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{R})^*$, ie. the space of multiplicatively invertible polynomially growing functions. A countable set Θ is called a set of polynomial growth if it is endowed with sets of functions $\mathcal{S}^{-\infty}(\Theta; \mathbb{R})^* \subset \mathcal{F}(\Theta; \mathbb{R})$ such that there is a bijection $\omega : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\omega^* \mathcal{S}^{-\infty}(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{R})^* = \mathcal{S}^{-\infty}(\Theta; \mathbb{R})^*$. It is notable that $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N} \dot{\cup} \mathbb{N}$ are sets of polynomial growth naturally; and that way we can define the direct product $\Theta_1 \times \Theta_2$ and direct sums $\Theta_1 \dot{\cup} \Theta_2$ of sets of polynomial growth Θ_1 and Θ_2 . In what follows the sets of polynomial growth we use will be like $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}$, or $\{1, \dots, n\} \times \mathbb{Z}$, where the description of the relevant function spaces is evident, so it will not be detailed. The main point is that a set Θ of polynomial growth is just like $\mathbb{N}$ for practical purposes.

1.5. If Θ_1, Θ_2 are of sets of polynomial growth and $\mathfrak{V}$ is a locally convex vector space then we can define some matrix spaces as follows:

a.)

$$\mathcal{M}^{\infty, \infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{V}) = \left\{ s \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{V}) : \forall p \in \Pi_{\mathfrak{V}} \exists f \in \mathcal{S}^{-\infty}(\Theta_1; \mathbb{R})^* \right. \\ \left. \exists g \in \mathcal{S}^{-\infty}(\Theta_2; \mathbb{R})^* \text{ s. t. } |s|_{\frac{1}{f}, p, \frac{1}{g}} = \sum_{(a,b) \in \Theta_1 \times \Theta_2} \left| \frac{1}{f(a)} \right| p(s_{a,b}) \left| \frac{1}{g(b)} \right| < +\infty \right\}.$$

With functions $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Pi_{\mathfrak{V}}; \mathcal{S}^{-\infty}(\Theta_1; \mathbb{R})^* \times \mathcal{S}^{-\infty}(\Theta_2; \mathbb{R})^*)$ and spaces

$$\mathcal{M}_F^{\infty, \infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{V}) = \left\{ s \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{V}) : \forall p \in \Pi_{\mathfrak{V}} \text{ s. t. } \right. \\ \left. |s|_{\frac{1}{F_1(p)}, p, \frac{1}{F_2(p)}} = \sum_{(a,b) \in \Theta_1 \times \Theta_2} \left| \frac{1}{F_1(p)(a)} \right| p(s_{a,b}) \left| \frac{1}{F_2(p)(b)} \right| < +\infty \right\}$$

the space $\mathcal{M}^{\infty,\infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{Y})$ is filtered and becomes an inductive locally convex space. This space is topologically the same as the column vector space $\mathcal{M}^{\infty,\infty}(\Theta_1 \times \Theta_2, \{*\}; \mathfrak{Y})$ which is also the same as $\mathcal{M}^{\infty,-\infty}(\Theta_1 \times \Theta_2, \{*\}; \mathfrak{Y})$ defined later.

b.)

$$\mathcal{M}^{\infty,-\infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{Y}) = \left\{ s \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{Y}) : \forall p \in \Pi_{\mathfrak{Y}} \forall g \in \mathcal{S}^{\infty}(\Theta_2; \mathbb{R})^* \right. \\ \left. \exists f \in \mathcal{S}^{\infty}(\Theta_1; \mathbb{R})^* \text{ s. t. } |s|_{\frac{1}{f}, p, g} = \sum_{(a,b) \in \Theta_1 \times \Theta_2} \left| \frac{1}{f(a)} \right| p(s_{a,b}) |g(b)| < +\infty \right\}.$$

With functions $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Pi_{\mathfrak{Y}} \times \mathcal{S}^{\infty}(\Theta_2; \mathbb{R})^*; \mathcal{S}^{\infty}(\Theta_1; \mathbb{R})^*)$ and spaces

$$\mathcal{M}_F^{\infty,-\infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{Y}) = \left\{ s \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{Y}) : \forall p \in \Pi_{\mathfrak{Y}} \forall g \in \mathcal{S}^{\infty}(\Theta_2; \mathbb{R})^* \text{ s. t. } \right. \\ \left. |s|_{\frac{1}{F(p,g)}, p, g} = \sum_{(a,b) \in \Theta_1 \times \Theta_2} \left| \frac{1}{F(p,g)(a)} \right| p(s_{a,b}) |g(b)| < +\infty \right\}.$$

the space $\mathcal{M}^{\infty,-\infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{Y})$ is filtered and becomes an inductive locally convex space. We can similarly define the space $\mathcal{M}^{-\infty,\infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{Y})$.

c.) We define

$$\mathcal{M}^{-\infty,-\infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{Y}) = \left\{ s \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{Y}) : \forall p \in \Pi_{\mathfrak{Y}} \forall f \in \mathcal{S}^{\infty}(\Theta_1; \mathbb{R})^* \right. \\ \left. \forall g \in \mathcal{S}^{\infty}(\Theta_2; \mathbb{R})^* \text{ s. t. } |s|_{f, p, g} = \sum_{(a,b) \in \Theta_1 \times \Theta_2} |f(a)| p(s_{a,b}) |g(b)| < +\infty \right\}.$$

This space is topologically the same as the column space $\mathcal{M}^{-\infty,-\infty}(\Theta_1 \times \Theta_2, \{*\}; \mathfrak{Y})$ which is also the same as $\mathcal{M}^{-\infty,\infty}(\Theta_1 \times \Theta_2, \{*\}; \mathfrak{Y})$.

d.) It is natural to define

$$\Psi(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{Y}) = \mathcal{M}^{-\infty,\infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{Y}) \cap \mathcal{M}^{\infty,-\infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{Y}),$$

the space of matrices of “pseudodifferential size”.

1.6. If $\mathfrak{A} \times \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ is a continuous bilinear pairing between locally convex spaces then we have induced continuous pairings

$$\mathcal{M}^{X,\infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{A}) \times \mathcal{M}^{-\infty,Y}(\Theta_2, \Theta_3; \mathfrak{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^{X,Y}(\Theta_1, \Theta_3; \mathfrak{C}),$$

$$\mathcal{M}^{X,Y}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{A}) \times \Psi(\Theta_2, \Theta_3; \mathfrak{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^{X,Y}(\Theta_1, \Theta_3; \mathfrak{C}),$$

$$\Psi(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{A}) \times \Psi(\Theta_2, \Theta_3; \mathfrak{B}) \rightarrow \Psi(\Theta_1, \Theta_3; \mathfrak{C}),$$

etc. These pairings are associative whenever the original pairings were. So come the algebra and module structures associated to matrices. Instead of $\mathcal{M}^{-\infty,-\infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{A})$ and $\mathcal{M}^{-\infty,-\infty}(\Theta; \mathfrak{A})$ we will use the notations $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_1, \Theta_2}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$, which are shorter. Instead of $\mathcal{M}^{\pm\infty,X}(\Theta, \{*\}; \mathfrak{A})$ it is reasonable to use $\mathcal{S}^{\pm\infty}(\Theta; \mathfrak{A})$, which is a consistent extension of our notation from earlier. One can also notice that there are natural isomorphisms like $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_1 \times \Theta'_1, \Theta_2 \times \Theta'_2}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \simeq \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_1, \Theta_2}^{-\infty}(\mathcal{K}_{\Theta'_1, \Theta'_2}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}))$, etc.

1.7. One standard tool one often uses is relabeling of matrices, which is as follows: Suppose that $\omega : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega'$ is a map between sets of polynomial growth, such that $\omega^* \mathcal{S}^{-\infty}(\Omega', \mathbb{R})^* = \mathcal{S}^{-\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})^*$. This includes the case when ω is an isomorphism of sets of polynomial growth, but also also the natural inclusions $\iota : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega' \cup \Omega''$, where

Ω'' is finite or an other set of polynomial growth. Let us now consider the matrix $R_\omega = \sum_{\alpha \in \Omega} \mathbf{e}_{\alpha, \omega(\alpha)} \in \Psi(\Omega, \Omega'; \mathbb{R})$. Then for a matrix $A \in \mathcal{M}^{X,Y}(\Theta; \mathfrak{A})$ or $\Psi(\Theta; \mathfrak{A})$ we can take the matrix $r_\omega(A) = R_\omega^\top A R_\omega$ which is a matrix of the same kind as A but Ω replaced by Ω' . This relabeling r_ω is a continuous, smooth operation, which is an isomorphism if ω is an isomorphism. We can similarly relabel matrices from $\mathcal{M}^{X,Y}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{A})$, etc.

1.8. The advantage of the spaces $\mathcal{M}^{X,Y}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{V})$ is that they are fairly large for the purposes of arithmetic calculations. On the other hand, their topological character (except in the case of $\mathcal{M}^{-\infty, -\infty}(\Theta_1, \Theta_2; \mathfrak{V})$) is rather obscure. However we may use these spaces to keep our arithmetical expressions well-defined. In the what follows only the algebras $\mathcal{K}^{-\infty}$ will be used explicitly. On the other hand, all computations, except in Lemma 2.8 and in Section 6 will be governed by the following

1.9. **Principle.** Every matrix expression is understood as element of $\Psi(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; \mathfrak{A})$, where Ω_i are sets of polynomial growth, and $\mathfrak{A}$ is a locally convex algebra; but we always hope that our expressions will yield results continuous in stronger topologies.

Due to the speciality of the algebras which follow we could have used more concrete topologizations for the computations, but this one fits as any other one.

2. THE ENVIRONMENT OF CYCLIC AND TOEPLITZ ALGEBRAS

The cyclic and Toeplitz algebras.

2.1. In what follows let $\overline{\mathbb{N}} = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathbb{Z} = \overline{\mathbb{N}} \dot{\cup} \mathbb{N}$. We make a canonical correspondence between $\mathbb{N}$ and $\overline{\mathbb{N}}$ by relabeling every n to $-1 - n$. Then, in what follows, we may consider every $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ matrix U as also a 2×2 matrix of $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ matrices:

$$U = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} U|_{\overline{\mathbb{N}} \times \overline{\mathbb{N}}} & U|_{\overline{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}} \\ \hline U|_{\mathbb{N} \times \overline{\mathbb{N}}} & U|_{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}} \end{array} \right] \simeq \begin{bmatrix} U^{--} & U^{-+} \\ U^{+-} & U^{++} \end{bmatrix},$$

such that on the right side the matrix entries are $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ matrices obtained by the correspondence explained above.

2.2. An element $a = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} a_i \mathbf{e}_i \in \mathcal{S}^{-\infty}(\mathbb{Z}; \mathfrak{A})$ can and will, in general, be identified with the Laurent series $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} a_i z^i \in \mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty$ with rapidly decreasing coefficients. We call this algebra, as the algebra of cyclic loops, in contrast to the algebra of proper loops $\mathcal{C}^\infty(S^1; \mathfrak{A})$. Then elements $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} a_i z^i \in \mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty$ can be represented by $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ matrices

$$U(a) = \sum_{n, m \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{n-m} \mathbf{e}_{n, m} = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ \ddots & a_0 & a_{-1} & a_{-2} & a_{-3} & a_{-4} & a_{-5} & \ddots \\ \ddots & a_1 & a_0 & a_{-1} & a_{-2} & a_{-3} & a_{-4} & \ddots \\ \ddots & a_2 & a_1 & a_0 & a_{-1} & a_{-2} & a_{-3} & \ddots \\ \hline \ddots & a_3 & a_2 & a_1 & a_0 & a_{-1} & a_{-2} & \ddots \\ \ddots & a_4 & a_3 & a_2 & a_1 & a_0 & a_{-1} & \ddots \\ \ddots & a_5 & a_4 & a_3 & a_2 & a_1 & a_0 & \ddots \\ \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{array} \right].$$

If $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{V})$ is the image set of $\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty$ through U then it is a subset of $\Psi(\mathbb{Z}; \mathfrak{V})$ algebraically but we put the topology of $\mathcal{S}^{-\infty}(\mathbb{Z}; \mathfrak{V})$ to it. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is an locally convex

algebra then $U : \mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_\mathbb{Z}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$ is an isomorphism of algebras, too. As already explained, we also have the 2×2 decomposition

$$U(a) = \begin{bmatrix} U(a)|_{\overline{\mathbb{N}} \times \overline{\mathbb{N}}} & U(a)|_{\overline{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}} \\ U(a)|_{\mathbb{N} \times \overline{\mathbb{N}}} & U(a)|_{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} U^{--}(a) & U^{-+}(a) \\ U^{+-}(a) & U^{++}(a) \end{bmatrix}.$$

2.3. As far as the linear structure is concerned we could have just used the matrices $U^{++}(a)$ to represent the elements a . The difference is that in terms of matrix multiplication

$$U^{++}(a)U^{++}(b) = U^{++}(ab) - U^{+-}(a)U^{-+}(b),$$

so there is an “anomalous” term $-U^{+-}(a)U^{-+}(b)$. If $a, b \in \mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty$ then $U^{+-}(a), U^{-+}(b) \in \mathcal{K}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$, so $U^{+-}(a)U^{-+}(b) \in \mathcal{K}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$. Let us define $\mathcal{W}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) = \{U^{++}(a) : a \in \mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty\}$. One can see that algebraically $\mathcal{W}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \cap \mathcal{K}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) = 0$. Hence it is reasonable to define the Toeplitz algebra

$$\mathcal{T}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) = \mathcal{W}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) + \mathcal{K}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}),$$

which is topologically just $\mathcal{W}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \oplus \mathcal{K}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$ but with the product rule

$$\begin{aligned} (U^{++}(a) + p)((U^{++}(b) + q)) &= \\ &= U^{++}(ab) + (-U^{+-}(a)U^{-+}(b) + U^{++}(a)q + pU^{++}(b) + pq), \end{aligned}$$

which is induced from the matrix structure. Algebraically, $\mathcal{T}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$ is just a subset of $\Psi(\mathbb{N}; \mathfrak{A})$, but a locally convex algebra.

2.4. So, there is a short exact sequence of algebras

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathcal{T}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mathcal{W}_\mathbb{Z}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow 0.$$

The map ι is the inclusion of the ideal of rapidly decreasing matrices into the Toeplitz algebra, while σ is the symbol map. In what follows we rather consider the value of the symbol map as an element of $\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty$, so we have the symbol homomorphism

$$\sigma : \mathcal{T}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty.$$

We can naturally extend this symbol map for unit groups, as we have seen.

In order to simplify the notation we will just write $W(a)$ instead of $U^{++}(a)$, and $Y(a)$ instead of $U^{-+}(a)$. By this notation

$$U(a) = \begin{bmatrix} W(a(z^{-1})) & Y(a(z)) \\ Y(a(z^{-1})) & W(a(z)) \end{bmatrix} \in \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{T}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) & \mathcal{K}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \\ \mathcal{K}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) & \mathcal{T}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is a small but important observation that the Toeplitz element in the lower right quadrant has symbol $a(z)$, but the Toeplitz element in the upper left quadrant has symbol $a(z^{-1})$.

The Toeplitz algebra can also be understood without matrices. It is the semigroup algebra of the bicyclic semigroup. (The bicyclic semigroup is generated by z_-, z_+ and with the sole relation $z_- z_+ = 1$.) Indeed, it is easy too see that every element of $\mathcal{T}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$ can uniquely be written in the form $\sum_{n,m \in \mathbb{N}} a_{n,m} W(z)^n W(z^{-1})^m$, where $\{a_{n,m}\}_{n,m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a rapidly decreasing matrix. Then, through the correspondences $z_+ \leftrightarrow W(z)$, $z_- \leftrightarrow W(z^{-1})$ we obtain a natural isomorphism $\mathfrak{A}[z_-, z_+]^\infty \simeq \mathcal{T}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$, where on the left side we have the semigroup algebra of the bicyclic semigroup with rapidly decreasing coefficients. The symbol map sends $z_+ \mapsto z$, $z_- \mapsto z^{-1}$.

2.5. For technical reasons we define the algebra

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}|\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{T}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) & \mathcal{K}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \\ \mathcal{K}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) & \mathcal{T}_\mathbb{N}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \end{bmatrix},$$

which is also naturally a locally convex algebra.

Furthermore, one can see that there are natural isomorphisms like $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathcal{K}_{\Omega}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})) \simeq \mathcal{K}_{\Omega}^{-\infty}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}))$, etc. In fact, all of our matrix space constructions considered as functors are naturally “commutative”.

2.6. Let $\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^{\infty, \text{po}}$ be the set of pointed loops, ie. where $a(1) = 0$. Then the elements $\tilde{a} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^{\infty, \text{po}})$ are those for which $\tilde{a}(1) = 1$. These pointed spaces are closed subspaces of the unpointed spaces. We can similarly define the pointed Toeplitz algebra $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})^{\text{po}}$, there the symbols are pointed.

The Bott involution map.

2.7. Beside the natural identification $1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \end{bmatrix}$, let us set the involution

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} -1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

In what follows we use the abbreviation $\Lambda(a, b) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + a + b - ab)$. Then

$$\Lambda(z, Q) = \begin{bmatrix} z1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We also use the delta-function $\delta_{n,m}$ which is 1 if $n = m$ and it is 0 otherwise.

If $a \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^{\infty})$ then we define the “Bott” involution

$$B(a) = U(a)QU(a)^{-1} \in Q + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$$

(cf. the symbols). To get an impression about B we list some of its properties:

2.8. **Lemma.** B can be “inverted” by the formula

$$a(z_1)a(z_2)^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} z_1^n \mathbf{e}_n^{\top} \right) (B(a) - U(z)B(a)U(z^{-1})) \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} z_2^m \mathbf{e}_{-m} \right).$$

The inverse operation is unique with the assumption $a(1) = 1$, when substitution by $z_2 = 1$ yields $a(z_1)$ explicitly; and substitution by $z_1 = 1$ yields $a(z_2)^{-1}$ explicitly.

Proof. Let $a(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} a_n z^n$, $a(z)^{-1} = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} b_m z^m$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} (B(a) - U(z)B(a)U(z^{-1})) &= \frac{1}{2} (U(a) (Q - U(z)QU(z^{-1})) U(a)^{-1}) = \\ &= U(a) \mathbf{e}_{0,0} U(a)^{-1} = \sum_{n,m \in \mathbb{N}} a_n b_m \mathbf{e}_{n,-m} \end{aligned}$$

implies the statement. The uniqueness statement is immediate. $\square$

2.9. **Proposition.** a.) If $c \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A})$ then $B(a) = B(ac)$; ie. B is immune for multiplication on the right by a constant.

b.) $B(\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^{\infty}))$ is a closed subspace of $Q + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$ (in the topology inherited from $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$).

c.) The map B induces a homeomorphism between the spaces $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^{\infty})^{\text{po}}$ and $B(\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^{\infty}))$.

In particular, $B(\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^{\infty}))$ may be used to represent $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^{\infty})/\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A})$.

Proof. (a) is immediate the definition. (b) follows from the fact that for the pointed preimage $(a(z), a(z)^{-1})$ we have a continuous formula, whose appropriateness can be tested by continuous, in fact, arithmetical, identities. (c) also follows from the continuous inverse formula. $\square$

2.10. Lemma. Suppose that $a(z) = \Lambda(z, \tilde{Q})$, where $\tilde{Q}$ is an involution. Then

$$B(a(z)) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \ddots & \\ \hline & -1 \\ \hline & \tilde{Q} \\ & 1 \\ & \ddots \end{array} \right].$$

Proof. Direct computation. □

Some concrete matrices: “shifting rotations”.

2.11. For $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ we define the matrices $E(a) = a\mathbf{e}_{00} \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$ and $E_{\mathbb{Z}}(a) = a\mathbf{e}_{00} \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$. Then, as usual, for $\tilde{a} = 1 + a \in 1 + \mathfrak{A}$ we extend these maps as $E(\tilde{a}) = 1_{\mathbb{N}} + E_{\mathbb{N}}(a)$ and $E_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{a}) = 1_{\mathbb{Z}} + E_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)$. Visually, for $\tilde{a} \in 1 + \mathfrak{A}$,

$$E(\tilde{a}) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{a} & & & \\ & 1 & & \\ & & 1 & \\ & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad E_{\mathbb{Z}}(\tilde{a}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & E_{\mathbb{N}}(\tilde{a}) \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \ddots & \\ \hline & 1 \\ \hline & \tilde{a} \\ & 1 \\ & \ddots \end{array} \right].$$

2.12. Our natural deformation parameter variable, in general, will be $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$, or, sometimes, more generally, $\theta \in S^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. To save space we often use $t = \sin \theta$ and $s = \cos \theta$ instead. It is useful to keep in mind that $s^2 = 1 - t^2$.

2.13. For $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ we define the matrices

$$C(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} s & ts & t^2s & t^3s & t^4s & \cdots \\ -t & s^2 & ts^2 & t^2s^2 & t^3s^2 & \ddots \\ & -t & s^2 & ts^2 & t^2s^2 & \ddots \\ & & -t & s^2 & ts^2 & \ddots \\ & & & -t & s^2 & \ddots \\ & & & & -t & \ddots \\ & & & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathbb{R}).$$

So,

$$C(\theta) = \begin{cases} E\left(\frac{1}{s}\right) W\left(\frac{1-tz}{1-tz^{-1}}\right) & \text{for } -1 < t < 1 \\ \pm W(-z) & \text{for } t = \pm 1 \end{cases}.$$

Some motivation for this definition is as follows. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$A_n(\theta) = \exp \theta(\mathbf{e}_{n,n+1} - \mathbf{e}_{n+1,n}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & \\ & & 1 & & \\ & & & s & t \\ & & & -t & s \\ & & & & 1 \\ & & & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, for a fixed θ ,

$$C(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_0(\theta) \cdot \dots \cdot A_n(\theta)$$

in some weak sense, say in $\Psi(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{R})$. In other words, $C(\theta)$ is an infinite product of certain elementary rotations.

Let $C(\theta)^\dagger$ denote the transpose of $C(\theta)$. Then

2.14. Lemma. *a.)*

$$C(\theta)^\dagger C(\theta) = 1_{\mathbb{N}}.$$

b.)

$$C(\theta)C(\theta)^\dagger = -\delta_{t,1}\mathbf{e}_{0,0} - \delta_{t,-1}\mathbf{e}_{0,0} + 1_{\mathbb{N}}.$$

c.)

$$C(\theta)\mathbf{e}_{n,m}C(\theta)^\dagger = \begin{bmatrix} t^{n+m}s^2 & t^{n+m-1}s^3 & \dots & t^n s^3 & -t^{n+1}s \\ t^{n+m-1}s^3 & t^{n+m-2}s^4 & \dots & t^{n-1}s^4 & -t^n s^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ t^m s^3 & t^{m-1}s^4 & \dots & s^4 & -ts^2 \\ -t^{m+1}s & -t^m s^2 & \dots & -ts^2 & t^2 \\ & & & & 0 \\ & & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

d.) For $n > 0$

$$C(\theta)W(z^n)C(\theta)^\dagger = -\delta_{t,1}\mathbf{e}_{0,0} - (-1)^n\delta_{t,-1}\mathbf{e}_{0,0} + \begin{bmatrix} t^n & & & & \\ t^{n-1}s & & & & \\ \vdots & & & & \\ ts & & & & \\ s & & & & \\ & 1 & & & \\ & & 1 & & \\ & & & 1 & \\ & & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

$C(\theta)W(z^{-n})C(\theta)^\dagger$ is the transpose of the matrix above.

Proof. Direct computation. □

3. STABILIZING HOMOTOPIES

3.1. Proposition. *The continuous map*

$$T_{\mathcal{K}} : \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \times S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$$

given by

$$A, \theta \mapsto T_{\mathcal{K}}(A, \theta) = C(\theta)AC(\theta)^\dagger$$

is smooth in θ . It yields a family of endomorphisms of $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$ when θ is fixed. These are isomorphisms for $-1 < t < 1$, and a closed injective endomorphism for $t = \pm 1$.

In particular, for $\theta = 0$

$$T_{\mathcal{K}}(A, 0) = A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix};$$

but for $\theta = \pm\pi/2$ ($t = \pm 1$)

$$T_{\mathcal{K}}(A, \pm\pi/2) = W(z)AW(z^{-1}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots \\ & a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots \\ & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. Well-definedness and smoothness follows from Lemma 2.14.c. Lemma 2.14.a implies that we have a family of endomorphisms. Furthermore, it also shows that $A = \mathcal{C}(\theta)^\dagger T_{\mathcal{K}}(A, \theta) \mathcal{C}(\theta)$; from which the statement about the nature of the endomorphisms follows easily. $\square$

Hence, taking $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$ we see that the deformation $T_{\mathcal{K}}$ does indeed realize a stabilizing homotopy even if only with one “extra dimension”. Nevertheless, after this, stabilization becomes a matter of standard tricks:

3.2. Corollary ($\rightarrow$ Statement 0.1). *Let Ω_1 and Ω_2 be set of polynomial growth; $\Omega = \Omega_1 \dot{\cup} \Omega_2$, and let $\omega : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_1 \subset \Omega$ be the composition of an isomorphism $\Omega \simeq \Omega_1$ and the natural inclusion $\Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_1 \dot{\cup} \Omega_2$. Then, we claim: There is a smooth map*

$$\widehat{T}_{\mathcal{K}} : \mathcal{K}_{\Omega}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S}) \times [0, \pi/2] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\Omega}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})$$

such that it yields a family of endomorphisms of $\mathcal{K}_{\Omega}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})$, which are isomorphisms for $\theta \in [0, \pi/2)$, and a closed injective endomorphism for $\theta = \pi/2$, such that

$$\widehat{T}_{\mathcal{K}}(A, 0) = \text{id}_{\mathcal{K}_{\Omega}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})}, \quad \widehat{T}_{\mathcal{K}}(A, \pi/2) = r_{\omega}.$$

The map $\widehat{T}_{\mathcal{K}}$ naturally extends (cf. 1.1) to unit groups.

Proof. Take $\mathfrak{A} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})$ in the previous statement. It yields our statement with $\Omega_1 = (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{N}$, $\Omega_2 = \{0\} \times \mathbb{N}$, $\omega((n, m)) = (n+1, m)$. Now, using an appropriate relabeling r_{η} of Ω we obtain the general statement. $\square$

Let us remark that due to the multiplicative structure, the concatenation of group valued homotopies is particularly simple: If $f, g : Y \times [0, 1] \rightarrow G$ yield homotopies $f_0 \simeq f_1$, $g_0 \simeq g_1$ where $f_1 = g_0$ then $h(y, t) = f(y, t)f(y, 1)^{-1}g(y, t)$ yields a homotopy between f_0 and g_1 . The advantage of this construction is that, for example, polynomial/smooth homotopies yield polynomial/smooth homotopies, and the operation is associative; in contrast to concatenation by reparametrization. Using this observation and the stabilizing homotopies above can easily prove

3.3. Corollary. *Let Ω_1, Ω_2 be sets of polynomial growth, and let $\iota_1 : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_1 \dot{\cup} \Omega_2$ be the natural inclusion. Assume that*

$$H : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{K}_{\Omega_1 \dot{\cup} \Omega_2}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S}))$$

is a smooth homotopy with maps $f_0, f_1 : X \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{K}_{\Omega_1}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S}))$ such that

$$H_0 = r_{\iota_1}(f_0), \quad \text{and} \quad H_1 = r_{\iota_1}(f_1).$$

Then, we claim, there is a smooth homotopy

$$f : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{K}_{\Omega_1}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S}))$$

extending f_0 and f_1 . This f can be chosen so that there is a smooth homotopy between H and $r_{\iota_1}(f)$ relative to endpoints.

In other words: “In stable algebras stable homotopies can be reduced to ordinary homotopies.” $\square$

4. LINEARIZATION OF CYCLIC LOOPS

4.1. Let v be a cyclic formal variable and let

$$V = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} v^n e_{n,n} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & v & & \\ & & v^2 & \\ & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad V^{-1} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} v^{-n} e_{n,n}.$$

Furthermore, let us consider

$$G(\theta, v) = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & V^{-1}C(\theta)V \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad G^\dagger(\theta, v) = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & V^{-1}C(\theta)^\dagger V \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let us now define for $a \in \mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty$

$$U(a, \theta, v) = \delta_{t,1}a(v)e_{00} + \delta_{t,-1}a(-v)e_{00} + G(\theta, v)U(a)G^\dagger(\theta, v).$$

4.2. a.) For $n > 0$ it yields $U(z^n, \theta, v) =$

$$= \left[\begin{array}{cccccccc|cccc} \ddots & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & & & & & & & \\ \hline & s & tsv & t^2sv^2 & t^3sv^3 & \dots & t^{n-1}sv^{n-1} & & t^n v^n & & & \\ & -tv^{-1} & s^2 & ts^2v & t^2s^2v^2 & \dots & t^{n-2}s^2v^{n-2} & & t^{n-1}sv^{n-1} & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & & \vdots & & & \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & t^2s^2v^2 & & t^3sv^3 & & & \\ & & & & \ddots & \ddots & ts^2v & & t^2sv^2 & & & \\ & & & & & \ddots & s^2 & & tsv & & & \\ & & & & & & -tv^{-1} & & s & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & 1 & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \ddots & \end{array} \right].$$

b.) $U(1, \theta, v) = 1_{\mathbb{Z}}$.

c.) For $n > 0$ it yields $U(z^{-n}, \theta, v) =$

$$= \left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccccccc} \ddots & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & & & & & & & \\ \hline & s & -tv & & & & & & & & & \\ & tsv^{-1} & s^2 & \ddots & & & & & & & & \\ & t^2sv^{-2} & ts^2v^{-1} & \ddots & \ddots & & & & & & & \\ & t^3sv^{-3} & t^2s^2v^{-2} & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & & & & \\ & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & & & \\ & t^{n-1}sv^{1-n} & t^{n-2}s^2v^{2-n} & \dots & t^2s^2v^{-2} & ts^2v^{-1} & s^2 & -tv & & & & \\ \hline & t^n v^{-n} & t^{n-1}sv^{1-n} & \dots & t^3sv^{-3} & t^2sv^{-2} & tsv^{-1} & s & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & 1 & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \ddots & \end{array} \right].$$

4.3. **Lemma.** *The continuous map*

$$U : \mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty \times S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})[v^{-1}, v]^\infty$$

defined by

$$a(z), \theta \mapsto U(a, \theta, v)$$

is smooth in θ . It yields a family of homomorphisms with fixed θ . The symbols remain constant. For $\theta = 0$

$$U(a, 0, \mathbf{v}) = \begin{bmatrix} W(a(z^{-1})) & Y(a(z)) \\ Y(a(z^{-1})) & W(a(z)) \end{bmatrix} = U(a(z))$$

while for $\theta = \pi/2$

$$U(a, \pi/2, \mathbf{v}) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} W(a(z^{-1})) & -\mathbf{v}Y(a(z)) \\ \hline -\mathbf{v}^{-1}Y(a(z^{-1})) & W(a(z)) \end{array} \right] \begin{array}{c} a(\mathbf{v}) \\ W(a(z)) \end{array}.$$

Proof. This is immediate from 4.2 by taking linear combinations. $\square$

4.4. Proposition ($\rightarrow$ Statement 0.2). *The continuous map*

$$K : \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty) \times S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})[\mathbf{v}^{-1}, \mathbf{v}]^{\infty, \text{po}})$$

defined by

$$a, \theta \mapsto K(a, \theta, \mathbf{v}) = \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, Q)^{-1} U(a, \theta, \mathbf{v}) \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, Q) U(a, \theta, 1)^{-1}$$

is smooth in the variable θ . Here

$$K(a, 0, \mathbf{v}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}^{-1} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \end{bmatrix} U(a) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \end{bmatrix} U(a)^{-1} = \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, Q)^{-1} \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, B(a))$$

but

$$K(a, \pi/2, \mathbf{v}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & E(a(\mathbf{v})a(1)^{-1}) \end{bmatrix} = E_{\mathbb{Z}}(a(\mathbf{v})a(1)^{-1}).$$

Proof. It immediately follows from the previous lemma. $\square$

4.5. Remark. It is safe to call this phenomenon as linearization of loops because multiplied by $\Lambda(\mathbf{v}, Q)$ it yields a homotopy between

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & E(a(\mathbf{v})a(1)^{-1}) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, U(a)QU(a)^{-1}) = \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, B(a))$$

in

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})[\mathbf{v}^{-1}, \mathbf{v}]^\infty.$$

4.6. Remark. Although we do not plan to discuss K -theory here as such, let us remind ourselves to the geometrical significance of this statement: For a locally convex algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ we can define

$$K_0(\mathfrak{A}) = \pi_0^{\text{smooth}}(\mathcal{I} \text{nv} \mathcal{O}l(Q + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}))),$$

the smooth path components of the involutions, which are perturbations of Q . One can similarly define

$$K_1(\mathfrak{A}) = \pi_0^{\text{smooth}}(\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}))).$$

Now, B , though this linearization argument induces an isomorphism

$$B_* : K_1(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^{\infty, \text{po}}) \rightarrow K_0(\mathfrak{A}).$$

This is the “hard part” of Bott periodicity.

4.7. Lemma. *Suppose that $a(z) = \Lambda(z, \tilde{Q})$, where $\tilde{Q}$ is an involution. Then $K(a, \theta)$ is constant in θ :*

$$K(a, \theta, \mathbf{v}) = E_{\mathbb{Z}}(a(\mathbf{v})).$$

Proof. Direct computation. $\square$

The lemma above is of significance, because in K -theory one prefers to linearize “small” perturbations of loops like $\Lambda(z, \tilde{Q})$. The lemma shows that the linearizing homotopy is not leaving that class of perturbations.

4.8. Remark. Although $U(a, \theta, \nu)$ is a rather symmetrical object, its definition involves an apparent asymmetry. One may wonder if this asymmetry can be avoided.

Let us consider the “conjugation involution” $\hat{Q} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{e}_{-n, n}$. Then $\hat{Q}U(a(z))\hat{Q} = U(a(z^{-1}))$, or more generally $\hat{Q}U(a(z), \theta, \nu)\hat{Q} = U(a(z^{-1}), \theta, \nu^{-1})$. So,

$$U(a(z), \theta, \nu) = \hat{Q}G(\theta, \nu^{-1})\hat{Q}U(a)\hat{Q}G(\theta, \nu^{-1})^\dagger\hat{Q},$$

ie. the conjugating matrix $G(\theta, \nu)$ can be replaced by $\hat{G}(\theta, \nu) = \hat{Q}G(\theta, \nu^{-1})\hat{Q}$. In particular, $\hat{G}(\theta, \nu)^{-1}G(\theta, \nu)$ must commute by $U(a)$. In fact, as the symbol suggests

$$U\left(\frac{1 - tz\nu^{-1}}{1 - tvz^{-1}}\right) = \hat{G}(\theta, \nu)^{-1}G(\theta, \nu).$$

Now, $\hat{G}(\theta, \nu)$ has the same kind of asymmetry as $G(\theta, \nu)$. In order to get a more symmetric conjugating matrix we may take the geometric mean of these matrices. In general, if A, B are invertible elements and BA^{-1} allows an appropriate square root then we may take the geometric mean

$$\sqrt{A \cdot B} = A\sqrt{A^{-1}B} = B\sqrt{B^{-1}A} = \sqrt{BA^{-1}}A = \sqrt{AB^{-1}}B.$$

In the present case with $A = G(\theta, \nu)$, $B = \hat{G}(\theta, \nu)$, $|t| < 1$ it yields the geometric mean

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}(\theta, \nu) &= \hat{G}(\theta, \nu)U\left(\sqrt{\frac{1 - tz\nu^{-1}}{1 - tvz^{-1}}}\right) = G(\theta, \nu)U\left(\sqrt{\frac{1 - tvz^{-1}}{1 - tz\nu^{-1}}}\right) \\ &= 1_{\mathbb{Z}^-}U\left(\sqrt{\frac{1 - tvz^{-1}}{1 - tz\nu^{-1}}}\right) + \mathbf{e}_{0,0}U\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{(1 - tz\nu^{-1})(1 - tvz^{-1})}}\right) + 1_{\mathbb{Z}^+}U\left(\sqrt{\frac{1 - tz\nu^{-1}}{1 - tvz^{-1}}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The extra symmetry of $\tilde{G}(\theta, \nu)$ is expressed by the identity $\hat{Q}\tilde{G}(\theta, \nu)\hat{Q} = \tilde{G}(\theta, \nu^{-1})$. In particular, $\tilde{G}(\theta, 1)$ commutes with $\hat{Q}$. Unfortunately, the elements of the matrix are not particularly simple, because they can be expressed as certain complete elliptic integrals, cf.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1 - tz)(1 - tz^{-1})}} &= \dots + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\mathbf{K}(t) - \mathbf{E}(t)}{t} z^{-1} + \frac{2}{\pi} \mathbf{K}(t) z^0 + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\mathbf{K}(t) - \mathbf{E}(t)}{t} z + \dots \\ \sqrt{\frac{1 - tz}{1 - tz^{-1}}} &= \dots + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{(1 - t^2)\mathbf{K}(t) + (2t^2 - 1)\mathbf{E}(t)}{3t} z^{-1} + \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{\pi} \mathbf{E}(t) z^0 + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{(1 - t^2)\mathbf{K}(t) - \mathbf{E}(t)}{t} z + \dots \end{aligned}$$

5. THE CONTRACTIBILITY OF THE POINTED STABLE TOEPLITZ UNIT GROUP

A reformulation of linearizability.

When we extend the stabilization procedure of Proposition 3.1 to Toeplitz algebras, something interesting happens: The symbol suddenly appears in the result.

Let $A \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$ with symbol σ . Then we define

$$T(A, \theta, \nu) = \delta_{t,1}\sigma(\nu)\mathbf{e}_{0,0} + \delta_{t,-1}\sigma(-\nu)\mathbf{e}_{0,0} + \mathbf{V}^{-1}\mathbf{C}(\theta)\mathbf{V}A\mathbf{V}^{-1}\mathbf{C}(\theta)^\dagger\mathbf{V}.$$

5.1. Proposition. *The continuous map*

$$T : \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) \times \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A}) + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})[\mathbf{v}^{-1}, \mathbf{v}]^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})[\mathbf{v}^{-1}, \mathbf{v}]^{\infty}$$

defined by

$$A, \theta \mapsto T(A, \theta, \mathbf{v})$$

is smooth in the variable θ . It yields a family of homomorphisms of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})$ to $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})[\mathbf{v}^{-1}, \mathbf{v}]^{\infty}$. The map leaves the symbol invariant.

For $\theta = 0$

$$T(A, 0, \mathbf{v}) = A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix};$$

but for $\theta = \pm\pi/2$ ($t = \pm 1$)

$$T(A, \pm\pi/2, \mathbf{v}) = \sigma(\pm\mathbf{v})\mathbf{e}_{0,0} + \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{z})A\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{z}^{-1}) = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma(\pm\mathbf{v}) & & & \\ & a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots \\ & a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots \\ & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. It follows from the direct inspection of the matrices in question. $\square$

5.2. Proposition. *The continuous map*

$$Z : \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})) \times \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})[\mathbf{v}^{-1}, \mathbf{v}]^{\infty, \text{po}})$$

defined by

$$A, \theta \mapsto Z(A, \theta, \mathbf{v}) = T(A, \theta, \mathbf{v})T(A, \theta, 1)^{-1}.$$

is smooth in θ . Here

$$Z(A, 0, \mathbf{v}) = 1,$$

but for $\theta = \pm\pi/2$ ($t = \pm 1$)

$$Z(A, \pm\pi/2, \mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{E}(\sigma(\pm\mathbf{v})\sigma(1)^{-1}).$$

Consequently, the symbols $\sigma(\mathbf{z})$ of invertible Toeplitz algebra elements are stably homotopic to constant loops $\sigma(1)$. If $\mathfrak{A} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})$ then (according to Corollary 3.2) stable homotopy implies the existence of ordinary homotopies.

Proof. This immediately follows from the previous proposition. $\square$

5.3. Suppose that Q is an involution, ie. $Q^2 = 1$, and $k \in \mathfrak{A}$. We will use the shorthand notation $k_Q^+ = \frac{1}{2}(k + QkQ)$, $k_Q^- = \frac{1}{2}(k - QkQ)$, $k_Q^{++} = \frac{1+Q}{2}k\frac{1+Q}{2}$, $k_Q^{+-} = \frac{1+Q}{2}k\frac{1-Q}{2}$, $k_Q^{-+} = \frac{1-Q}{2}k\frac{1+Q}{2}$, $k_Q^{--} = \frac{1-Q}{2}k\frac{1-Q}{2}$.

Let us define

$$L(Q, k) = \mathbf{W}(\Lambda(\mathbf{z}, Q))k\mathbf{W}(\Lambda(\mathbf{z}^{-1}, Q)) = \begin{bmatrix} k_Q^{++} & k_Q^{+-} & & \\ k_Q^{-+} & k_Q^{++} & k_Q^{+-} & \\ & k_Q^{-+} & k_Q^{++} & \ddots \\ & & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

This is a homomorphism in k and we can extend it to $\tilde{k} \in 1 + \mathfrak{A}$ as before.

5.4. Let us assume that $Q = \mathbb{Q}$ and $k \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}|\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})$. Set

$$\tilde{L}(k) = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cccc} \ddots & \ddots & & & & & \\ & \ddots & k_Q^+ & k_Q^{-+} & & & \\ & & k_Q^{+-} & k_Q^+ & & & \\ \hline & & & & k_Q^{-+} \mathbf{e}_{00} & k_Q^{-+} \mathbf{e}_{10} & k_Q^{-+} \mathbf{e}_{20} & \cdots \\ & & \mathbf{e}_{00} k_Q^{+-} & \mathbf{e}_{00} k_Q^{++} & \mathbf{e}_{00} k_Q^{++} \mathbf{e}_{10} & \mathbf{e}_{00} k_Q^{++} \mathbf{e}_{20} & \cdots & \\ & & \mathbf{e}_{01} k_Q^{+-} & \mathbf{e}_{01} k_Q^{++} & \mathbf{e}_{01} k_Q^{++} \mathbf{e}_{10} & \mathbf{e}_{01} k_Q^{++} \mathbf{e}_{20} & \cdots & \\ & & \mathbf{e}_{02} k_Q^{+-} & \mathbf{e}_{02} k_Q^{++} & \mathbf{e}_{02} k_Q^{++} \mathbf{e}_{10} & \mathbf{e}_{02} k_Q^{++} \mathbf{e}_{20} & \cdots & \\ & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \end{array} \right]$$

Again, this is a homomorphism in k and we can extend it to $\tilde{k} \in 1 + \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}|\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})$. (What happened here compared to $L(k, Q)$ is the following: We inflated the first row and column to infinitely many rows and columns, and reordered the matrix.)

Assume now that $k \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}|\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S}))$, and the symbol of its lower right quadrant is $a(z)$. We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}(k) \Lambda(k^{-1}, \mathbb{Q}_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}|\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})}) \mathcal{U}(k \Lambda(z^{-1}, \mathbb{Q}) k^{-1} \Lambda(z, \mathbb{Q})) = \\ \tilde{L}(k) \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} \ddots & & \\ & k^{-1} & \\ & & k^{-1} \\ \hline & & 1 \\ & & & \ddots \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} \ddots & \ddots & \\ & k(k^{-1})^+ & k(k^{-1})^{-+} \\ & k(k^{-1})^{+-} & k(k^{-1})^+ \\ \hline & & k(k^{-1})^{+-} & k(k^{-1})^+ & \ddots \end{array} \right] \\ = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cccc} \ddots & & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & \\ & & e_{00} & e_{01} & e_{02} & e_{03} & \cdots \\ \hline & & e_{10} & e_{11} & e_{12} & e_{13} & \cdots \\ & & e_{20} & e_{21} & e_{22} & e_{13} & \cdots \\ & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{array} \right] \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}|\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S}))). \end{aligned}$$

The lower right quadrant will have symbol

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbb{Z}}(a(z)) k \Lambda(z^{-1}, \mathbb{Q}) k^{-1} \Lambda(z, \mathbb{Q}).$$

Then, it is reasonable to define

$$N(k) = \begin{bmatrix} e_{00} & e_{01} & e_{02} & \cdots \\ e_{10} & e_{11} & e_{12} & \cdots \\ e_{20} & e_{21} & e_{22} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix},$$

which is of symbol $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbb{Z}}(a(z)) k \Lambda(z^{-1}, \mathbb{Q}) k^{-1} \Lambda(z, \mathbb{Q})$. Let us set $G(a) = N(\mathcal{U}(a))$.

5.5. Proposition. *The continuous map*

$$G : \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{S}[[z]]) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})))$$

is such that the symbol of $G(a)$ is

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbb{Z}}(a(z)) \mathcal{U}(a) \Lambda(z^{-1}, \mathbb{Q}) \mathcal{U}(a)^{-1} \Lambda(z, \mathbb{Q}).$$

Proof. That immediately follows from the construction. $\square$

Now, according to Proposition 5.2 and Corollary 3.3 the mere existence of the map above implies that the symbol $E_{\mathbb{Z}}(a(z))U(a)\Lambda(z^{-1}, Q)U(a)^{-1}\Lambda(z, Q)$ is homotopic to 1. That yields a different manifestation of linearizability.

Contractibility.

5.6. Proposition ($\rightarrow$ Statement 0.3). *The unit group $U(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S}))^{p_0})$ is smoothly contractible.*

Proof. We prove the statement up to stabilization. Then stabilization can be removed according to Corollary 3.3.

a.) First of all, consider any element $A \in U(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S}))^{p_0})$. According to Proposition 5.2 its symbol a is (stably) homotopic to the constant loop 1. Applying Proposition 5.5 to this homotopy we see that it is enough to prove that Toeplitz units with symbol $\Lambda(z^{-1}, Q)U(a)\Lambda(z, Q)U(a)^{-1}$ can be contracted.

b.) Consider A further as above. Let

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{Z}} & \\ & Q \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} -1_{\mathbb{N}} & & & \\ & -1_{\mathbb{N}} & & \\ \hline & & -1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & & & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \end{array} \right];$$

here the double lines show how we decompose this block matrix of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ matrices to a block matrix of $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ matrices. Furthermore, let

$$S(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} s & & -t \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \\ t & & s \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & & \\ & 1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & & W(a(z^{-1})) & Y(a(z)) \\ & & Y(a(z^{-1})) & W(a(z)) \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & & & \\ & W(a^{-1}(z)) & Y(a^{-1}(z^{-1})) & \\ & Y(a^{-1}(z)) & W(a^{-1}(z^{-1})) & \\ & & & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & & \\ & A & \\ & & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \\ & & & A^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} s & & t \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \\ -t & & s \end{bmatrix} \\ \in U(\mathcal{K}_{\{1,2\} \times \mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S}))$$

and take $L(-Q, S(\theta))S(\theta)^{-1} \in U(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathcal{K}_{\{1,2\} \times \mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S})))$. That yields a homotopy between $L(-Q, S(0))S(0)^{-1}$ and $L(-Q, S(\pi/2))S(\pi/2)^{-1}$. These elements have symbols

$$\Lambda(z, -Q)S(0)\Lambda(z^{-1}, -Q)S(0)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{Z}} & \\ & \Lambda(z^{-1}, Q)U(a)\Lambda(z, Q)U(a)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\Lambda(z, -Q)S(\pi/2)\Lambda(z^{-1}, -Q)S(\pi/2)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{Z}} & \\ & 1_{\mathbb{Z}} \end{bmatrix},$$

respectively. So, Toeplitz units with symbol $\Lambda(z^{-1}, Q)U(a)\Lambda(z, Q)U(a)^{-1}$ can be deformed to Toeplitz units with trivial symbols. According to part (a) now it is enough to show that elements with trivial symbol can be contracted.

c.) Now, if the symbol of a Toeplitz unit A is 1. According to standard stabilization arguments we can assume that $A = E(k)$ where $k = \begin{bmatrix} k_0 & \\ & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \end{bmatrix} \in U(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S}))$. Let

$$k(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} s & t \\ -t & s \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k_0 & \\ & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} s & -t \\ t & s \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $k(\theta)L(Q, k(\theta))^{-1}$ yields a homotopy between $k(0)L(Q, k(0))^{-1} = E(k) = A$ and $k(\pi/2)L(Q, k(\pi/2))^{-1} = 1$. $\square$

5.7. Remark. If the locally convex algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ is what like in [4] is called strong, ie. for all seminorm p there is a seminorm $\tilde{p}$ such that $p(X_1 \dots X_n) \leq \tilde{p}(X_1) \dots \tilde{p}(X_n)$ holds for all n then the proof can be simplified greatly: In that case the associated algebras are also strong, and the smooth homotopy lifting property holds for the symbol map. So, using Proposition 5.2 the proof of the contractibility statement immediately reduces to point (c), hence making points (a) and (b), and the construction of 5.4 unnecessary.

5.8. Remark. Stabilization was an important assumption in the previous statement. For example, $U(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathbb{C})^{p_0})$ is not contractible. In fact, $U(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathbb{C}))$ cannot be contracted in $U(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathbb{C}))$. Indeed, one can show that in $U(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathbb{C}))$ the regularized determinant

$$\text{reg det } A = \det(A \sigma(1)^{-1} \exp W(-\log(\sigma(z)/\sigma(1))))$$

is well-defined and

$$\text{reg det } E(a) = a.$$

(To show well-definedness we use that the index of σ is 0 and so logarithm can be taken. Another point is that in nice algebras one can exponentiate.) From this it follows that E restricted to the unit circle is not null-homotopic.

6. OTHER TYPES OF ALGEBRAS AND MODIFICATIONS

6.1. Quite often the algebras one works with are $*$ -algebras, which means that there is a continuous contravariant involution $*$. Then for matrix algebras, instead of simple transposition $^{\top}$ we can take the (formal) adjoint † , which is transposition combined by $*$ in the usual manner. Elements $A \in U(\mathfrak{A})$ with the property $A^{\dagger} = A^{-1}$ are called unitary. Let us denote their set by $U^*(\mathfrak{A})$. In accordance to the matrix case the adjoint operation extends to $\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^{\infty}$ by $z^{\dagger} = z^{-1}$ and to $\mathfrak{A}[z_{-}, z_{+}]^{\infty}$ by $(z_{+})^{\dagger} = z_{-}$. Then the natural question arises: Can we execute the stabilizations, linearizations, and contractions discussed inside $U^*(\cdot)$, without stepping out into $U(\cdot)$?

The answer is affirmative: all of our constructions are formulated in such a way that they respect unitarity.

6.2. Another question is the following: Can we repeat our constructions in a category slightly different from the rapidly decreasing matrices?

First is the case of “algebraic topology”. In that case we allow only finite matrices instead of rapidly decreasing ones, and only finite Laurent series instead of rapidly decreasing ones. So $^{-\infty}$ should be replaced by f everywhere. Then, however, our algebras will be only inductive locally convex algebras, filtered by matrix size, and/or Laurent series length. Otherwise our constructions remain valid. True, $C(\theta)$ is not in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}^f(\mathbb{R})$, but conjugating by it leaves that algebra invariant, as Lemma 2.14 shows. On the level of individual elements the notion of homotopy becomes polynomial homotopy, but it is also continuous in the sense of inductive locally convex algebras.

6.3. Also often considered is the case of special matrix classes over $\mathbb{R}$, when we take the closure of finite matrices under a special norm invariant to conjugation by unitary matrices. Examples include the spaces of compact operators (under the usual norm) and the Hilbert-Schmidt operators (with the Hilbert-Schmidt norm). Then, because they were essentially achieved via conjugation by unitary matrices, our stabilization constructions extend, giving, say, continuous homotopies.

A more intriguing question is what to do with the cyclic loops, what is the best way to topologize them. In general, the key is to topologize the corresponding Toeplitz algebras; but also see Pressley and Segal, [6], Ch. 6. On the other hand, in algebras where we can approximate (which include Banach algebras, and much more) such questions are not so important, because we can always smooth out loops by taking, say, approximations by Fejér's method.

For example, if $\overline{}^{\mathbb{N}}$ denotes norm closure then it is immediate that the space $\overline{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S}))^{\text{po}})}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is contractible. On the other hand, it is also not hard to see that this space $\simeq \mathcal{U}(\overline{\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-\infty}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{S}))^{\text{po}}})^{\mathbb{N}} \simeq \mathcal{U}(\overline{\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{\text{f}}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{f}}(\mathfrak{S}))^{\text{po}}})^{\mathbb{N}}$, etc., getting a connection to the original setting of Cuntz [2].

6.4. We mention that the pair of $\mathbb{C}(\theta)$ and $\mathbb{C}(\theta)^{\dagger}$ can be modified for $-1 < t < 1$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{C}}(\theta) &= W \left(\frac{1-tz}{1-tz^{-1}} \right) = W(1-tz^{-1})^{-1}W(1-tz) = \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1-t^2 & t(1-t^2) & t^2(1-t^2) & t^3(1-t^2) & t^4(1-t^2) & \cdots \\ -t & 1-t^2 & t(1-t^2) & t^2(1-t^2) & t^3(1-t^2) & \cdots \\ & -t & 1-t^2 & t(1-t^2) & t^2(1-t^2) & \ddots \\ & & -t & 1-t^2 & t(1-t^2) & \ddots \\ & & & -t & 1-t^2 & \ddots \\ & & & & -t & \ddots \\ & & & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{C}}'(\theta) &= W \left(\frac{1-tz^{-1}}{1-tz} \right) E \left(\frac{1}{1-t^2} \right) = W(1-tz)^{-1}W(1-tz^{-1}) = \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -t & & & & \\ t & 1-t^2 & -t & & & \\ t^2 & t(1-t^2) & 1-t^2 & -t & & \\ t^3 & t^2(1-t^2) & t(1-t^2) & 1-t^2 & -t & \\ t^4 & t^3(1-t^2) & t^2(1-t^2) & t(1-t^2) & 1-t^2 & -t \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the conjugating matrices $\begin{bmatrix} s & t \\ -t & s \end{bmatrix}$ can be replaced by $\begin{bmatrix} 1-t^2 & t \\ -t & 1 \end{bmatrix}$.

That way we lose unitarity but all the expressions involve only polynomial functions of t . In fact, using the matrices above one can formulate some of our statements formally for general rings.

7. ALGEBRAICALLY FINITE CYCLIC LOOPS

7.1. Although otherwise quite satisfying, a practical disadvantage of $\mathbb{B}(a)$ is that it is, in general, an infinite perturbation of $\mathbb{Q}$. The exception is when $a \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^{\text{f}})$, but this is a rather restrictive condition from geometrical viewpoint. (On the other hand, $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}^{\text{f}}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{f}}(\mathfrak{A}))^{\text{po}})$ is a technically simpler construction for a large contractible space than in the smooth case.) Here we argue that we can do well in the case when a can be represented by finite loops but it is not in $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^{\text{f}})$.

7.2. A loop $a(z) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty)$ is an $L(m, n)$ -finite loop if $a(z) = \sum_{m \leq j \leq n} a_j z^k$. A loop $a(z)$ is an $R(m, n)$ -finite loop, if its inverse $a(z)^{-1}$ is an $L(-n, -m)$ -finite loop. For a finite sequence $F = \{(m_j, n_j)\}_{1 \leq j \leq s}$ let

$$\mathfrak{A}_F = \{(a_s, \dots, a_1) : a_j \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty) \text{ is } L(m_j, n_j) \text{ or } R(m_j, n_j)\text{-finite}\}.$$

We say that $a \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}[z^{-1}, z]^\infty)$ is algebraically finite of type F if $a = a_s \dots a_1$, for an element $(a_s, \dots, a_1) \in \mathfrak{A}_F$.

7.3. For $m \leq 0 \leq n$ we say that a matrix A is an $L(m, n)$ -perturbation of A_0 if

$$A = A_0 + \sum_{m \leq i \leq n, j \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{i,j} \mathbf{e}_{i,j},$$

for $a_{i,j}$ chosen suitably. Similarly we can define $R(m, n)$ -perturbations by interchanging the role of i and j in the expression above. An (m, n) -perturbation is a matrix which is both an $L(m, n)$ -perturbation and an $R(m, n)$ -perturbation.

In what follows we will always be concerned of perturbations of $\Lambda(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{Q}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & \\ & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \end{bmatrix}$, where $\mathbf{s}$ is equal to 1, -1 , or an other formal variable $\mathbf{v}$. We can notice that both $L(m, n)$ -perturbations and $R(m, n)$ -perturbations of $\Lambda(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{Q})$ can be reduced to (m, n) -perturbations by taking direct cut-offs of unwanted matrix elements:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} & & \\ L^- & M & L^+ \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{Red}_{(m,n)}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} & & \\ & M & \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \xleftarrow{\text{Red}_{(m,n)}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} & R^- & \\ & M & \\ & & R^+ & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

7.4. **Lemma.** Suppose that A is an $L(m, n)$ or $R(m, n)$ -perturbation of $\Lambda(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{Q})$ and let $\tilde{A}$ be the reduction of A to an (m, n) -perturbation of $\Lambda(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{Q})$. Let us use the notation

$$C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t) = A + t(\tilde{A} - A).$$

In particular, $C_{A, \tilde{A}}(0) = A$, $C_{A, \tilde{A}}(1) = \tilde{A}$. We claim:

a.) If A was invertible, then $C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t)$ ($t \in \mathbb{R}$) is an invertible:

$$C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t)^{-1} = A^{-1} C_{A, \tilde{A}}(-t) A^{-1}.$$

Moreover, it is true that A^{-1} is an $L(m, n)$ or $R(m, n)$ -perturbation, respectively, whose (m, n) -reduction is $\tilde{A}^{-1}$; and $C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t)^{-1} = C_{A^{-1}, \tilde{A}^{-1}}(t)$. The identity

$$C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t) = C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t/2) A^{-1} C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t/2)$$

also holds.

b.) If A was an involution then $C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t)$ ($t \in \mathbb{R}$) is an involution. In fact,

$$C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t) = C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t/2) A C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t/2) = C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t/2) A C_{A, \tilde{A}}(t/2)^{-1}.$$

Proof. It is enough to examine the L case because the R case is completely analogous. It is not hard to see that the only possible shape for A^{-1} is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s}^{-1} & & \\ -\mathbf{s}^{-1} M^{-1} L^- & M^{-1} & -M^{-1} L^+ \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then all calculations follow from the fact that $\tilde{A} A^{-1} = 1 + C$, where the elements $1 + tC$ form a one-parameter group. $\square$

7.5. **Lemma.** If $a(z) = \sum_{m \leq j \leq n} a_j z^k$ then $U(a, \theta, \mathbf{v})$ is an (m, n) -perturbation of $\mathcal{U}(a)$.

Proof. This is immediate from 4.2. $\square$

7.6. Lemma. *Suppose that A is an (m', n') -perturbation of $\Lambda(s, Q)$, $m' \leq 0 \leq n'$. Then, we claim,*

If a is an $L(m, n)$ - or $R(m, n)$ -finite loop then

$$U(a, \theta, v)AU(a, \theta, w)^{-1}$$

is an $L(m + m', n + n')$ - or $R(m + m', n + n')$ -perturbation of $\Lambda(s, Q)$, respectively.

Proof. a.) The L case: Let $a(z) = \sum_{m \leq j \leq n} a_j z^j$. Then $U(a, \theta, v)$ is a (m, n) -perturbation of $U(a)$. Consider $e_k^\top$, where $k > n + n'$ or $k < m + m'$. Being $k > n$ or $k < m$ we find that $e_k^\top U(a, \theta, v) = e_k^\top U(a) = \sum_{m \leq j \leq n} e_{k-j}^\top a_j$. Now $k - j > n'$ or $k - j < m'$ respectively, and A is an (m', n') -perturbation of $\Lambda(s, Q)$, so $e_{k-j}^\top A = h e_{k-j}^\top$ where $h = 1$ if $k > n + n'$ and $h = s$ if $k < m + m'$. This implies

$$e_k^\top U(a, \theta, v)A = \left(\sum_{m \leq j \leq n} a_j e_{k-j}^\top \right) A = h \sum_{m \leq j \leq n} a_j e_{k-j}^\top = h e_k^\top U(a, \theta, w),$$

from which $e_k^\top U(a, \theta, v)AU(a, \theta, w)^{-1} = h e_k^\top = e_k^\top \Lambda(s, Q)$. This latter equality which holds for appropriate k is exactly the statement of having an $L(m + m', n + n')$ -perturbation. The R case is similar. $\square$

7.7. Now, let $F = \{(m_j, n_j)\}_{1 \leq j \leq s}$ be a finiteness type and $\tilde{a} = (a_s, \dots, a_1) \in \mathfrak{A}_F$. Let $a = a_s \dots a_1$. Set $M_k = m_1 + \dots + m_k$, $N_k = n_1 + \dots + n_k$.

a.) Let us define $H_0(\tilde{a}, \theta, v) = \Lambda(v, Q)$, which is an $(0, 0)$ -perturbation of $\Lambda(v, Q)$. Then set

$$\hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, v) = U(a_k, \theta, v)H_{k-1}(\tilde{a}, \theta, v)U(a_k, \theta, 1)^{-1}$$

and

$$H_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, v) = \text{Red}_{(M_k, N_k)}(\hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, v)).$$

According to Lemma 7.6 these matrices $\hat{H}_k$, H_k are well-defined; $\hat{H}_k$ is always an $L(M_k, N_k)$ or $R(M_k, N_k)$ -perturbation of $\Lambda(v, Q)$, while H_k is an (M_k, N_k) -perturbation of $\Lambda(v, Q)$.

b.) Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} U_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, h, v) &= C_{\hat{H}_s(\tilde{a}, \theta, v), H_s(\tilde{a}, \theta, v)}(h) C_{\hat{H}_s(\tilde{a}, \theta, -1), H_s(\tilde{a}, \theta, -1)}(h/2)^{-1} \\ &\quad \hat{H}_s(\tilde{a}, \theta, -1) \hat{H}_s(\tilde{a}, \theta, v)^{-1} U(a_s, \theta, v) \dots \\ &\quad \dots C_{\hat{H}_1(\tilde{a}, \theta, v), H_1(\tilde{a}, \theta, v)}(h) C_{\hat{H}_1(\tilde{a}, \theta, -1), H_1(\tilde{a}, \theta, -1)}(h/2)^{-1} \\ &\quad \hat{H}_1(\tilde{a}, \theta, -1) \hat{H}_1(\tilde{a}, \theta, v)^{-1} U(a_1, \theta, v). \end{aligned}$$

7.8. In order to get the next proposition in a more compact form we make some additional definitions:

a.) We define series of involutions by $Q_0(\tilde{a}) = Q$,

$$\hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}) = U(a_k)Q_{k-1}(\tilde{a})U(a_k)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_k(\tilde{a}) = \text{Red}_{(M_k, N_k)}(\hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a})).$$

One may immediately notice that $Q_k(\tilde{a}) = H_k(\tilde{a}, 0, -1)$. We set

$$B_F(\tilde{a}) = Q_s(\tilde{a}).$$

Consider the involutions $\tilde{Q}_k(\tilde{a}) = U(a_s \dots a_{k+1})Q_k(\tilde{a})U(a_s \dots a_{k+1})^{-1}$. Notice that $\tilde{Q}_0(\tilde{a}) = B(a)$, $\tilde{Q}_s(\tilde{a}) = B_F(\tilde{a})$.

b.) We define

$$U_F(\tilde{a}, h) = C_{\hat{Q}_s(\tilde{a}), Q_s(\tilde{a})}(h/2) \hat{Q}_s(\tilde{a}) U(a_s) \dots C_{\hat{Q}_1(\tilde{a}), Q_1(\tilde{a})}(h/2) \hat{Q}_1(\tilde{a}) U(a_1).$$

We see that

$$U_F(\tilde{a}, h) = C_{\tilde{Q}_{s-1}(\tilde{a}), \tilde{Q}_s(\tilde{a})}(h/2) \tilde{Q}_{s-1}(\tilde{a}) \cdots C_{\tilde{Q}_0(\tilde{a}), \tilde{Q}_1(\tilde{a})}(h/2) \tilde{Q}_0(\tilde{a}) U(a).$$

In particular, $h = 0$ yields $U_F(\tilde{a}, 0) = U(a)$, but $h = 1$ yields

$$U_F(\tilde{a}, 1) = \left(\frac{1 + \tilde{Q}_s(\tilde{a}) \tilde{Q}_{s-1}(\tilde{a})}{2} \right) \cdots \left(\frac{1 + \tilde{Q}_1(\tilde{a}) \tilde{Q}_0(\tilde{a})}{2} \right) U(a).$$

7.9. Lemma. *It yields*

- o.) $H_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, 1) = 1$,
- i.) $U_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, 0, \mathbf{v}) = U(a, \theta, \mathbf{v})$,
- ii.) $U_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, 1, \mathbf{v}) = H_s(\tilde{a}, \theta, \mathbf{v}) U_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, 1, 1) \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q})^{-1}$,
- iii.) $U_F(\tilde{a}, \pi/2, h, \mathbf{v}) = U(a, \pi/2, \mathbf{v})$,
- iv.) $U_F(\tilde{a}, 0, h, \mathbf{v}) = U_F(\tilde{a}, h)$.

Proof. o.) By induction $H_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, 1) = \hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, 1) = 1$ is clear.

i.) We see that $C_{\hat{H}_k, H_k}(0/2) \hat{H}_k^{-1} = 1$, and $C_{\hat{H}_k, H_k}(0) \hat{H}_k^{-1} = 1$, so $U_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, 0, \mathbf{v})$ naturally gets simplified to $U(a_s, \theta, \mathbf{v}) \cdots U(a_1, \theta, \mathbf{v}) = U(a, \theta, \mathbf{v})$.

ii.) If $h = 1$ then we have the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{\hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, \mathbf{v}), H_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, \mathbf{v})}(1) C_{\hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, -1), H_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, -1)}(1/2)^{-1} \hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, -1) \hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, \mathbf{v})^{-1} U(a_k, \theta, \mathbf{v}) \\ &= H_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, \mathbf{v}) C_{\hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, -1), H_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, -1)}(1/2)^{-1} \hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, \theta, -1) U(a_k, \theta, 1) H_{k-1}(\tilde{a}, \theta, \mathbf{v})^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying these terms for all k , and taking (o) into account, we obtain (ii).

iii.) If $\theta = \pi/2$ then all our matrices split into two independent blocks. One is the $\{0\} \times \{0\}$ block, the other is the $(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\})$ block. The $\{0\} \times \{0\}$ block is entirely unaffected by reduction. The other block can be reindexed into $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ by pushing down positive indices by 1. Let us denote this reindexed block conjugated by $\mathbf{Q}$ by $\#$. Then

$$U(a_k, \pi/2, \mathbf{v})^\# = \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q}) U(a_k) \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q})^{-1}$$

(cf. Lemma 4.3), and, of course $\Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q})^\# = \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_1(\tilde{a}, \pi/2)^\# &= U(a_k, \pi/2, \mathbf{v})^\# \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q})^\# (U(a_k, \pi/2, 1)^{-1})^\# = \\ &= (\Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q}) U(a_1) \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q})^{-1}) \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q}) U(a_1)^{-1} = \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q}), \end{aligned}$$

and so $H_1(\tilde{a}, \pi/2) = \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q})$. In that way we see that all the $\hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, \pi/2)^\#$ and $H_k(\tilde{a}, \pi/2)^\#$ are all equal to $\Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q})$. So we can see that no reduction happens ever at all. But then $C_{\hat{H}_k, H_k}(0/2) \hat{H}_k^{-1} = 1$, $C_{\hat{H}_k, H_k}(0) \hat{H}_k^{-1} = 1$, and so

$$U_F(\tilde{a}, \pi/2, h, \mathbf{v}) = U(a_s, \pi/2, \mathbf{v}) \cdots U(a_1, \pi/2, \mathbf{v}) = U(a, \pi/2, \mathbf{v}).$$

iv.) $U(a_k, 0, \mathbf{v}) = U(a_k)$. Then $H_k = \text{Red}_{(M_k, N_k)}(U(a_k) H_{k-1} U(a_k)^{-1})$, which shows by induction that all that $\hat{H}_k$ and H_k must be linear loops generated by involutions. So, $\hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, 0, \mathbf{v}) = \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}))$, $H_k(\tilde{a}, 0, \mathbf{v}) = \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, Q_k(\tilde{a}))$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, 0, \mathbf{v}), H_k(\tilde{a}, 0, \mathbf{v})}(h) &= C_{\Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a})), \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, Q_k(\tilde{a}))}(h) = \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, C_{\hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}), Q_k(\tilde{a})}(h)) = \\ &= \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, C_{\hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}), Q_k(\tilde{a})}(h/2) \hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}) \hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}) \hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}) C_{\hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}), Q_k(\tilde{a})}(h/2)) = \\ &= C_{\hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}), Q_k(\tilde{a})}(h/2) \hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}) \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a})) \hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}) C_{\hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}), Q_k(\tilde{a})}(h/2) = \\ &= C_{\hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}), Q_k(\tilde{a})}(h/2) \hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}) H_k(\tilde{a}, 0, \mathbf{v}) \hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, 0, -1) C_{\hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, 0, -1), H_k(\tilde{a}, 0, -1)}(h/2). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$C_{\hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, 0, \mathbf{v}), H_k(\tilde{a}, 0, \mathbf{v})}(h) C_{\hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, 0, -1), H_k(\tilde{a}, 0, -1)}(h/2)^{-1} \cdot \hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, 0, -1) \hat{H}_k(\tilde{a}, 0, \mathbf{v})^{-1} U(a_k, 0, \mathbf{v}) = C_{\hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}), Q_k(\tilde{a})}(h/2) \hat{Q}_k(\tilde{a}) U(a_k).$$

Multiplying these identities (iv) is immediate. $\square$

7.10. Proposition ($\rightarrow$ Statement 0.5). *The continuous map*

$$K_F : \mathfrak{A}_F \times [0, \pi/2] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-\infty}(\mathfrak{A})[\mathbf{v}^{-1}, \mathbf{v}]^{\infty, \text{po}})$$

defined by

$$K_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, h) = \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q})^{-1} U_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, h, \mathbf{v}) \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q}) U_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, h, 1)^{-1}$$

is smooth in $[0, \pi/2] \times [0, 1]$, and it has the following properties:

- i.) $K_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, 0) = K(a, \theta)$;
- ii.) $K_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, 1)$ is equal to

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q})^{-1} \text{Red}_{(M_s, N_s)}(U(a_s, \theta, \mathbf{v}) \dots \text{Red}_{(M_1, N_1)}(U(a_1, \theta, \mathbf{v}) \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q}) U(a_1, \theta, 1)^{-1}) \dots U(a_s, \theta, 1)^{-1}),$$

which is an (M_s, N_s) -perturbation of $1_{\mathbb{Z}}$;

- iii.) $K_F(\tilde{a}, \pi/2, h) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbb{Z}}(a(\mathbf{z})a(1)^{-1})$ is constant;
- iv.) $K_F(\tilde{a}, 0, h) = \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q})^{-1} \mathbf{U}_F(\tilde{a}, h) \Lambda(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{Q}) \mathbf{U}_F(\tilde{a}, h)^{-1}$. Here $\mathbf{U}_F(\tilde{a}, h)$ differs from $\mathbf{U}(a)$ in a rapidly decreasing matrix and $\mathbf{U}_F(\tilde{a}, h) = \mathbf{U}(a)$.

This yields:

The linearizing homotopy $K(a, \theta)$ of $a(\mathbf{v})a(1)^{-1}$ can be deformed into the finite perturbation linearizing homotopy $K_F(\tilde{a}, \theta, 1)$ of $a(\mathbf{v})a(1)^{-1}$. The Bott involution $\mathbf{B}(a) = \mathbf{U}(a)\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{U}(a)^{-1}$ gets replaced by the involution

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}_F(\tilde{a}) &= \mathbf{U}_F(\tilde{a}, 1) \mathbf{U}(a)^{-1} \mathbf{B}(a) (\mathbf{U}_F(\tilde{a}, 1) \mathbf{U}(a)^{-1})^{-1} = \\ &= \text{Red}_{(M_s, N_s)}(\mathbf{U}(a_s) \dots \text{Red}_{(M_1, N_1)}(\mathbf{U}(a_1) \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{U}(a_1)^{-1}) \dots \mathbf{U}(a_s)^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

which is an (M_s, N_s) -perturbation of $\mathbf{Q}$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 7.9. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] Atiyah, M.; Bott, R.: On the periodicity theorem for complex vector bundles. *Acta Math.* **112** (1964), 229–247.
- [2] Cuntz, J.: K -theory and C^* -algebras, pp. 55–79 in *Algebraic K-theory, number theory, geometry and analysis (Bielefeld, 1982)*, edited by A. Bak, Lecture Notes in Math. **1046**, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1984.
- [3] Cuntz, J.: Bivariant K -theory and the Weyl algebra. *K-Theory* **35** (2005), 93–137.
- [4] Lakos, Gy.: Smooth K -theory and locally convex algebras, PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2003.
- [5] Melrose R. B.; Rochon F.: Families index for pseudodifferential operators on manifolds with boundary. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **22**, (2004), 1115–1141.
- [6] Pressley, A.; Segal, G.: Loop groups. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford University Press, New York, 1986.

DEPARTMENT OF GEOMETRY, EÖTVÖS UNIVERSITY, PÁZMÁNY PÉTER S. 1/C, BUDAPEST, H-1117, HUNGARY

E-mail address: lakos@cs.elte.hu